

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-28 are pending.

Claims 1-28 are rejected.

Claim 1 is amended to claim "at least one financial transaction" instead of having to claim a "plurality of financial transactions". This is being made to broaden the scope of the claim and is not made in view of the cited prior art. Claim 1 is also amended to clarify the operation of the claimed content in the operation of the claims. Support for what content is found in the specification on page 6, lines 17-24, and in other places. Finally, the operation of Claim 1 is amended to specify the relationship between a user receiver and a content provider. Support for this claimed element is found in the specification on page 9, line 14 to page 10, line 9, Figs. 2A-B, and in other places.

Claim 6 is amended to claim that the user receiver is a set top box (see variations of receiver 103 in the specification). Also, a plurality of formats (more than two) are to be considered in the matching step, see specification page 13, line 27 to page 14, line 8, and in other places.

Claim 9 is amended to claim a function to linking information as being information to access a specific content provider.

Claim 20 is amended to claim that enhanced content programming is a television program; support for this amendment is found in the specification on page 6, lines 20-23. The claim is also amended to claim the authorization of a content provider. Support for this amendment is found in the specification on page 9, line 29 to page 10, line 8, and in other places.

Claim 24 is amended to consider a plurality of display capabilities. Support for this amendment is found in the specification on page 13, line 27 to page 14, line 8, and in other places.

No new matter was added in view of these amendments.

**I. U.S.C. 102(e) Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-28**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dejaeger, (U.S. Patent 6,296,185). Applicants disagree with this ground on rejection.

Regarding the rejection to Claim 1, the Applicants note that the reference does not at all disclose the concept of having a content provider who would provide content to a user receiver. Respecting the Examiner's decision to interpret the claim language broadly, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 as to claim that said at least one content provider "transmits on-demand content to a user receiver by a network". That is, the content being claimed as provided by at least one content provider would be on-demand programming. The delivery of on-demand programming is neither disclosed nor suggested in the Dejaeger reference.

That is, the Dejaeger reference is a physical retail terminal system which one would find in a retail store such as Wal-Mart or Target where a user may use such a terminal to physically buy groceries (see Abstract of Dejaeger). Specifically, a user uses a pre-scan area 12 to scan items such as groceries which are sensed via a scanner sensor (98, 100) (see Dejaeger, col. 6, lines 54-63). Applicants note that a grocery system that one would find at a Wal-Mart has nothing to do with the delivery of on-demand content which is provided by a content provider (as claimed in Claim 1) which would be provided to a user receiver.

Moreover, the grocery check out system does not disclose the element of "content corresponding to each of said selected one or more financial transactions is authorized to be transmitted to said user receiver by said at least content providers affected by said selected one or more financial transactions". That is, on-demand programming will be delivered to a user receiver by a content provider when one or more financial transaction is authorized. The

grocery check-out system of Dejaeger neither discloses nor suggested this claimed step.

Claim 3 claims the element of “including linking information to a specific content provider”. This specific element of Claim 3 is neither disclosed nor suggested in Dejaeger. Dejaeger does teach the concept of displaying of displaying an advertisement related to a grocery that a person is buying at a store (Dejaeger, col. 59, lines 49-64) such as when a person buys beer from a store, one would see an advertisement for beer. This disclosure of Dejaeger has nothing to do with a claimed content provider (as in Claim 3) nor does such advertisement of Dejaeger provide “linking information” to a content provider. Applicants have amended Claim 9 to give more of a definition to linking information which “allows a user to access a specific content provider”.

The operation of Claim 6 is not disclosed or suggested in Dejaeger. Specifically, Dejaeger does disclose the idea of having a specific format in which to display a check out transaction such as using item price, item description, and the like (see Dejaeger, col. 6, lines 48-56). This operation however has nothing to do with determining the display capabilities of a set top box which operates as the user receiver. That is, Dejaeger also knows how information is going to be displayed without considering the “display capabilities” of the user receiver where the display capabilities affect which format is to be used, unlike what is claimed in Claim 6. That is, the disclosed system of Dejaeger does not perform the operation of Claim 6 nor is such an operation even suggested.

Claim 20 is patentable (for the same reasons listed above for Claim 1) as the operation of delivering enhanced content programming of a television program (for a user receiver)

from a content provider is neither disclosed or suggested in Dejaeger. That is, the disclosures and teachings of Dejaeger do not disclose the existence of content providers or the delivery of enhanced content from such content providers which would be authorized in view of financial transaction.

For the reasons given above, Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejections to Claims 1, 3, 6, 9, and 20 are patentable for the reasons listed above. Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to Claims 2, 4, 5, 7-8, and 11-19, and Claims 21-24, and 26-28, as such claims depend on allowable Claims 1 and 20, respectively.

## **II. U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claims 10 and 25**

The Examiner rejected Claims 10 and 25 as being anticipated by 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dejaeger in view of Fields (U.S. Patent 4,400,724). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

Claim 10 claims “displayed summary information is displayed as a semi-transparent screen overlay”. Presumably, this would be a function of a user interface where the display summary transaction would be displayed semi-transparently within the context of displaying text on a screen (in front of a background). The Examiner in contrast acknowledges that Dejaeger does not disclose or suggest such a claimed element, but that when combined with Fields, such an element is taught.

Fields teaches a specific structure of using a video combiner 100 that displays a video signal in a full intensity of color while having a second video signal from overhead cameras be displayed as a white and black signal which will be reduced in intensity and appear “ghost-like on the screen as a semi-transparent overlay” (Fields, col. 11, lines 3-7).

Applicants request that the Examiner supply some type of rationale as why one would combine the check out grocery system of Dejaeger with the virtual reality system of Fields which utilizes overhead cameras to produce a semi-transparent overlay? That is, in order to produce the semi-transparent display of Fields with Dejaeger, as skilled artisan would have to utilize an external black and white camera as an input signal (from Fields) which is focused upon displayed summary information (from Dejaeger). That is, one of the ordinary skill in the art would not apply Fields with Dejaeger, as stated by the Examiner, as the outcome is complex would not disclose the operation of Claim 10. The same argument applies for Claim 25.

For the reasons given above, Applicants assert Claims 10 and 25 are patentable and such claims depend on allowable Claims 1 and 20, respectively. Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to these claims.

Applicants request a three month extension to file this response under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a). The Applicants have charged the fee for this extension and for a corresponding Request for Continuing Examination to Deposit Account 07-0832 using EFS-WEB. If any additional fees are owed in connection with this response, please charge this Deposit Account, as well.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Joel M. Fogelson, Attorney for  
Applicants  
Registration No.: 43,613  
(609) 734-6809

Date: April 18, 2008